

And third, the allowances will not be reduced for surviving spouses who are more than 20 years younger than the contributor.

Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat unfortunate, though, that the Government did not choose to bring in these amendments at the same time that it presented a similar law which we passed in 1987, Bill C-88 for the surviving spouses of judges. As we know, the Bill resulted from a recommendation of the Guthrie Commission in 1986, whose mandate was to study the salaries and benefits of judges.

In this report—and to clarify somewhat the Minister's statement that the Government is making this amendment as part of an overall plan, let us say frankly that constitutional considerations forced the Government to meet its obligations. I just want to quote a paragraph of the Guthrie Report: failure to amend the Judges Act (judges were the issue, but it can apply to federal civil servants) to permit continuation of survivors' benefits upon remarriage may raise serious legal questions involving equality rights. We therefore recommend the repeal of subsections 25(3) and 25(3.1) of the Judges Act.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Government did. In my opinion, what was good for the judges, as I said in the debate then, is also good for public servants, military people, RCMP officers and all the other servants of the state who I think were considered second class citizens, because nothing was done for them.

That being said, I am for passing this Bill because it will finally bring our laws into line with section 15 (of the Charter) and also satisfy the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee in *Towards Equality*, a report published in 1985 on the subject. I will not read all the recommendations, but anyone interested can refer to the document. It contains a whole series of recommendations that the Government bring the pension legislation into line with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which took effect, as we know, in 1985.

Superannuation

I shall come back to that shortly, because I think that the Government was at fault in refusing to make it retroactive to the proclamation of the Charter in 1985.

Mr. Speaker, on examining these pension plans, we see many deficiencies, inconsistencies and rather disturbing features still in the legislation.

I admit that the Minister told us that a more thorough and complete study of pensions would be done and that more comprehensive legislation might be presented in the fall.

• (1200)

[*English*]

I would like to draw to the attention of Members my preoccupation, and that of some of my colleagues on this side of the House, with certain other laws before us today to be amended in regard to re-marriage and the rights of the children of a married pensioner. There is a section entitled *Pension de retraite des Forces canadiennes*. I guess it is called The Armed Forces Superannuation Act or some wording of that nature.

[*Translation*]

Clause 33 contains provisions which I find absolutely unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

In the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act—

[*English*]

I will read the Superannuation Act concerning military personnel, Section 31(1), because I think this is something that Members will want to correct. Section 31(1) deals with marriage after 60 years of age.

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the surviving spouse of a person is not entitled to any annual allowance under this Act if that person was over sixty years of age at the time of his marriage, unless, after that time, that person became or continued to be a contributor.

Another section that bothers me, Section 31(2), says:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, except as provided in the regulations a child who was born to or adopted by a person or who became the stepchild of a person at a time when that person was over sixty years of age is not entitled to any annual allowance under this Act, unless, after that time, that person became or continued to be a contributor.